

**New York Tribune**  
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1917  
Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Office: 125 Broadway, New York. Telephone: 1000.  
Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$1.50; 1 year, \$2.50.  
Daily only, 6 mos. \$1.00; 1 year, \$1.75.  
Sunday only, 6 mos. \$0.50; 1 year, \$0.90.  
Entered as Second-Class Matter, March 1, 1879, under Post Office No. 100, New York, N. Y., Post Office No. 100, New York, N. Y.

**CANADIAN RATES**  
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$1.50; 1 year, \$2.50.  
Daily only, 6 mos. \$1.00; 1 year, \$1.75.  
Sunday only, 6 mos. \$0.50; 1 year, \$0.90.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**Time to Declare War**

At last the Administration faces an "overt act" on Germany's part which it can hardly explain away. American citizens travelling on the Laconia have been murdered under exactly the same conditions as those under which American citizens were murdered nearly two years ago on the Lusitania and the Arabic.

Mr. Wilson has said many times that he would not tolerate any more such murders. He has pledged himself again and again to "protect our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits on the seas." The implication of all his promises has been that if one more American life should be sacrificed he would meet force with force.

Now the occasion has come which compels him to make his words good. If those words mean anything, the Administration is bound in honor to ask Congress to declare war.

Nothing short of a declaration of war will suffice. When the President dismissed von Bernstorff and recalled Gerard he said that on the commission of another "overt act" by Germany he would seek authority from Congress to employ force in defence of American rights. Finding that Germany's threats were having "all the effect of 'overt acts' in driving our shipping from the seas, he went to Congress on Monday and asked for authority to put guns on American merchantmen and to initiate a policy of armed neutrality.

It may be that a policy of armed neutrality—borrowed from the practice of the Adams Administration against France in 1798—was all that Mr. Wilson had in mind when he told Congress on February 3 last of his intention to use force against Germany in certain contingencies. It may be that he intended to reply to another massacre of Americans merely by resorting to a half-pacific expedient like that.

If he did, he misjudged the temper of the American people. Mere commercial depredations may be properly met with semi-warlike resistance. But the slaughter of our citizens in cold blood—a crime repeated again and again by Germany—calls for something more. It calls for a remonstrance through which flashes all our long-restrained and righteous wrath, into which all our capacity for self-respecting indignation can be put. It calls not for an amateurish experiment in near war, but for real war, undertaken with a serious appreciation of what war now means.

It is folly to suppose that we can accomplish anything for the defence of American rights, anything for the restoration of former standards of international good faith and justice, anything for the peace and progress of the world, by playing at war with Germany. Germany and Austria-Hungary have, for all practical purposes, already declared war on us. They have committed acts which leave no possible doubts as to their hostile purposes. The present situation is intolerable—a state of war on their side and a state of peace or near peace on ours. The only honorable and sensible way to end this humiliating condition is for the President to ask Congress to declare war or for Congress to declare it without waiting for a prompting from him.

**Suffrage Progress**

It is interesting to note that whereas there was much bickering over action on the woman suffrage amendment last year and no little genuine antagonism to it on the part of legislators, this year it has passed the Assembly with scant opposition, and has now been reported favorably by the Senate committee by

unanimous vote. Its passage by the Senate seems assured, so that without doubt the question will again be submitted to the voters this fall.  
Equal suffrage is making progress fast these days and is rapidly moving East. Gains of importance, at least of significance, have been recorded in Ohio, Indiana and in Maine, the furthest east. New York should not be permitted to lag behind. Two years ago, though the amendment was defeated, a splendid vote was recorded for it. With thorough organization and as good work in the rural counties as has been done in recent times in the cities, the suffragists have every right to look forward to a victory here. If they do not carry the state this time it will be to the discredit of the community reactionary enough to refuse twice the help of these women who seek to do their share in the work of government.

**No Blind Dictatorship**

Supporters of the President are naturally anxious to gloss over the dictatorial character of the powers which he has asked Congress to turn over to him. "The World" compares the action which he urged Congress to take with the action taken by Congress in 1898, before the outbreak of the war with Spain.  
Congress then of its own motion appropriated \$500,000,000, "for the national defence, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President." But the Congress which did this was not on the point of adjourning *sine die*. It intended to remain in session for many months thereafter. It intended to have its say in the determination of our Cuban policy. And it did have its say.

Congress, not the President, precipitated the war with Spain. Some time after it had voted the \$500,000,000 for the national defence it passed resolutions authorizing the President to use the armed forces of the United States to compel the Spanish government to retire from Cuba. Later on in the session it passed a declaration of war against Spain. Still later it passed a law extending American sovereignty over Hawaii.

The 55th Congress was an able and aggressive body. It would have treated with scorn a suggestion from the White House that it should efface itself by adjournment and grant vast and undefined *ad interim* powers to the President, to be used by him without restraint or interference in the execution of a policy still undeclared, perhaps not even formulated. President McKinley's relations with Congress were always cordial and intimate. He would never have dreamed of asking the two houses to vote him such an unlimited, indeterminate dictatorship.

The services of the 55th Congress were indispensable to the prosecution of the Spanish War. Congress had to provide for the raising of a volunteer army. We are comparatively speaking—worse off in a military sense to-day than we were in 1898. For Germany's military power certainly exceeds ours by much more than ours exceeded Spain's.

The services of the 65th Congress are, therefore, indispensable to the prosecution of a war with Germany—even though that war may be disguised at first as mere "belligerent neutrality." Any attempt to shunt Congress into the background, to deprive it of its rightful share in the determination of our national policy, would therefore involve a serious crippling of governmental powers. It would also involve a violent departure from the precedents of cordial cooperation between Congress and the President which have been respected in all our wars. The President is enough of a dictator as it is. He should not be vested now with powers which belong to Congress and can be exercised to better advantage by Congress.

**Fish Farming**

The State College of Agriculture at Cornell makes the suggestion, distinctly interesting in view of the present foodstuffs situation, that fish farming can be made to pay in this state. There is no reason why it should not. In fact, it is paying some enterprising individuals possessed of mountain land with spring-fed ponds on it, who have established trout hatcheries and market their product to hotels and restaurants at nice, fat figures. What can be done on this small scale can be done on a larger scale, and what can be done with trout should not prove impossible with other excellent food fish, notably the bass and the scuppers. As for the hardy and ugly carp, once introduced into the streams and lakes of this state—much to the disgust of sportsmen then and since—with the special view of adding to the food resources, there is no trouble in raising him anywhere, and there is a steady sale for carp as carp on the East Side in this city, without regard to all the carp which finds its way to consumers as smoked sturgeon.

Another suggestion for increasing the available food supply by utilizing the state's waters comes from Deputy Attorney General Lewis. He thinks the waters of the large canal should be planted with such fish as are native to the lakes and the Mohawk and Hudson rivers, which the canal traverses. Under the direction of the Conservation Department a valuable source of food supply could thus be built up, he believes. Undoubtedly it could be. It would be desirable for the state to undertake it, just as it would be desirable for the state to follow the suggestion so often made—that it adopt legislation and enforce it against the pollution of the Hudson, so that that ancient and honorable source of much valuable food fish, notably the Hudson River shad, nobler of them all, and the sturgeon, might once more yield plentifully.

The present high prices of foodstuffs are not due entirely to grasping middlemen, voracious producers, extortionate storemen and speculators and conscienceless retailers. They are due in part to the fact that food production is lamentably unsystematized, so that the rewards of it are not steady and sure enough to tempt the

toilers to constant maximum output. They are due in part to the fact that this country, so rich in food resources that it has been wasteful, has neglected or spoiled sources of supply. It will be a long time before meat prices come down, if they ever do. Dealers in sea fish, realizing that, have raised their prices so that most salt water fish represent comparatively small savings in expenditure compared with meats. This state might well undertake to encourage the commercial raising of fish by "fish farmers," and ought to use every possible means to protect the purity of the waters of its lakes and rivers, so that what commercial fishing is done in them may not cease, as it practically has in the Hudson.

**A Vital Line of Defence**

How vitally important to the defence of the country is a mosquito fleet of small volunteer craft was made eloquently clear by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, in his address at the New York Yacht Club. At least 750 such vessels, manned by 10,000 men, are needed for the New York district alone. In urging owners of motor boats and steam yachts to put their craft overboard at once Mr. Roosevelt made clear the navy's view of the extreme and immediate danger which we face.

The submarine has changed utterly the weapons of coast defence. The feat of the U-53 in making Newport Harbor after a voyage of 4,000 miles should bring home to us the truth with which England has been made all too familiar in the last two years and a half. The major ships of a navy are no line of defence against the submarine. It is the destroyers and fast shoal-draft motor boats—too shallow of body to be victims of torpedoes—that must be relied upon to fight this new menace. As the naval expert "Nauticus" pointed out in The Tribune recently, the menace to us involves the possible use of secret bases in Labrador, in the West Indies, in Mexico. When Germany assails our coast, we can count upon her attacking us with her favorite sea weapon in the most effective and carefully planned fashion.

Against such attack we shall need every small vessel that can be obtained. The patrol of our extended coast and numerous harbors will be a gigantic task that will require all the resources and seafaring ability we can muster. Here is where the appeal to our amateur sailorsmen is particularly strong. They have a special knowledge, gained through years of small-boat sailing, which makes them invaluable. They enter the service not as unskilled militiamen, like the rookies of the army, but as experts possessing a unique equipment. These are the men to whom Mr. Roosevelt especially appealed. If they have boats they should list them for immediate service. Wherever possible they should volunteer their services at once without waiting for a declaration of war.

In no branch of our national defence is the need as urgent as here. In no other way can Americans more vitally aid their country.

**State Police in Sight**

Adoption of the Mills state police bill by the Republican caucus in both houses assures the passage of that worthy and useful measure at this session of the Legislature. For that the state should be duly grateful. Its enactment will be a variety of preparation for emergencies which the state surely needs now, and the operation of the police under this law will give New York, beyond a peradventure, a better and more complete enforcement of law in the rural districts than has ever before been known.

There is a certain satisfaction in the fact that the insolent challenge of the leaders of organized labor to the Legislature has been met. Their antagonism killed the bill last year. If there had been stiffer spines in the legislators the police would now be patrolling rural roads and doing a great deal of work which the National Guard has had to undertake recently. It would have been shameful if in this year, when the need for this force is so patent and so compelling, the Legislature had again truckled to the representatives of a class in the community which seeks a special exemption from enforcement of law against its own misdeeds.

It is to be hoped the bill will be put into final shape and passed promptly. Organization and equipment of a force of this nature are bound to take some time. The less time it is before New York has its state policemen at work, the better.

**THOSE TIMID SHIPS**

[Our own commerce is suffering—rather because so many of our ships are timidly keeping to their home ports than because American ships have been sunk.—The Editor.]  
What's that? The President's order sweeps our commerce from the main.  
Our factories are idle and our cargoes line the shores?  
Who'd sail to hell and back to sell their closely hoarded stores?  
It cannot be because our ships are sunk beneath the foam,  
But merely that they're all remaining timidly at home.

What matter if the seaweed grows on twenty liners' bones?  
We have a tidy number to replace the ones we lose.  
What matter if a hundred men go down to Davy Jones?  
A hundred million wait behind to step into their shoes.  
It cannot be because our ships are sunk beneath the foam,  
But merely that they're all remaining timidly at home.

If we should arm our merchantmen, then Germany could prove  
We wanted war, and in that war the flower of youth would fall.  
If women want to travel and if cargoes have to move,  
Why, let them take a chance and go—the seas are free to all.  
It cannot be because our ships are sunk beneath the foam,  
But merely that they're all remaining timidly at home.  
A. R. F.

**IF DISASTER COMES**

**The Terrible Responsibility That Will Rest Upon Congress and the President**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: From the beginning of the war I have read the editorials in The Tribune in relation to it with great interest. I heartily endorse all of them. If the country suffers a fearful military disaster, which is quite within the realm of possibilities, it will not be for lack of either warning or information from The Tribune.

So far as proper preparation is concerned, Congress and the President appear to be so completely indifferent, with an apparent disposition to pass the responsibility along to the shoulders of the people at large. If disaster comes, the people, smarting from their injuries and losses, will pass it back with interest to the place where it belongs, to Congress and the President.

Congress and the President are the officials whom the people have elected to administer the government, and they cannot shirk the responsibility. They have had the amplest warning of possible military disaster and have ignored the warning. If the disaster comes upon us, the President and the individual members of Congress will be obliged to bear the heavy moral responsibility for the murders, robberies, rapes and other deeds of violence inflicted by a victorious army upon a conquered people, to say nothing of the moral responsibility for the slaughter of raw recruits and untrained soldiers. The President and Congress will also be obliged to bear the justly merited curses of the parents, sisters, children and widows of the slaughtered soldiers who will have died without a sporting chance for their lives because of the ignorance and indifference of Congress.

In writing the foregoing I had in mind the statement by Light Horse Harry Lee, quoted in "The Nation's Military Policy," to the effect that a nation is guilty of the murder of its citizens which put them untrained into the field against trained soldiers.  
I have given up all hope that Congress will do anything adequate toward the protection of the country, for if it could take no step toward preparation in two years and a half, with the war devil continually staring it in the face, it is hopeless to expect anything reasonable from it now.

The honor and prestige of the country are at stake, and the President and Congress appear to have forgotten that it ever had any. Patriotism, so far as Congress is concerned, appears to consist solely in standing uncovered when the band plays "The Star-Spangled Banner."  
WILLIAM A. MORGAN.  
Providence, R. I., Feb. 24, 1917.

**Village Vapors in Congress**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: The divine right of kings to rule is an exploded idea. However, for a nation to continue in the delusion is no worse than to be led by the mediocre and the commonplace. The type of legislation that emanates, or is attempted at least, was illustrated last week when a United States Senator entered a resolution to prohibit cigarette advertisements from the mails. To post yesterday's newspaper without clipping out all such advertising would have made your innocent sender a sort of felon had it passed. Instead of big themes requiring thought we get the vapors of the village. Every opportunity is offered to the eccentric to impose his personal opinions on the public. Free silver, the seamen's bill, bone dry prohibition, palatial postoffices in poky little towns, appropriations to dam up the creek—all in turn are vociferated over, and now comes the attempt to suppress about the only source left.

Such incidents as these constitute a severe indictment of our political system—a system that enables almost any wearer of cap and bells with a prolix vocabulary to occupy high places. The first requisite of a legislator should be an understanding of the well-springs of human nature and the thought that flows therefrom. The legislator with a present mind, even if not a superior mind, would not advance legislation in a matter of common sense as whether the following of tobacco advertisements is good or bad advice. As a matter of fact, it is none of his business to interfere with matters that do not affect the common weal.

Doubtless, the times will right themselves and again men with a "message" will mold public opinion as they did in the old New England lyceum days of Emerson, Wendell Phillips, Theodore Parker, Charles Sumner, thinkers and scholars, men with a mental equipment that penetrated the minds of other men with enduring thoughts. As it is, the indictments of Billy Bryan, Billy Sunday and a thousand of their ilk of lesser note are upon us.  
It floats so naturally to mind that to quote Ralph Waldo cannot be resisted: "The day is darkened when the golden river runs down into mud."  
CHARLES CLIFFORD TINKLER.  
Maplewood, N. J., Feb. 24, 1917.

**Keep Congress in Session**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: I am one of those who, earnestly supporting our President, believe that a great mistake will be made if Congress is not kept in session during these critical times. It is no time for us to take chances or to allow Germany (or the Kaiser) to infer that any act on the part of the United States leaves the way open for other acts of intimidation on the part of Germany to oppress the wrath of those at home who are restless under the Kaiser's autocratic rule. True, the President is in a position to know more of the true situation than any of our people, but it is wise to leave the way open when so many of our people are conveying the impression that Americans are divided in sentiment on the war question, and in the end may turn against their President.  
The Tribune is right. Let us not leave any foreign power to infer that our people are unwilling to enter upon war to protect our citizens or to defend our country.  
C. AUGUSTUS HAVLAND.  
Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 25, 1917.

**The Pacifist Adventure**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: May I suggest that Kate Parsons, Wellesley, 1911, read H. G. Wells's "Research Magnificent" and get the understanding of the word "adventure" that was in the minds of the editorial board of "Four Lights"?  
Miss Parsons may be living "a generation ago," but the editors of "Four Lights" are living and thinking to-day.  
The advertisement in question is not an error or a mistake—but evidently it has been in the nature of a revelation to her.  
B. E. CRAWFORD.  
Rand School of Social Science.  
New York, Feb. 23, 1917.

**One Check to Turn**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: This query from a foreign correspondent may interest you: "Are you really going to war, or has W. W. another check to turn and the check to turn it?"  
V. C.  
New York, Feb. 26, 1917.

**A DEFECT IN OUR NEW BATTLE - CRUISERS**

**An Expert View of the Proposed Electrical Drive Involving Exposure of One-Half of the Ship's Boilers**

By NAUTICUS.

Unquestionably the most important ships of the new naval programme are the six great battle cruisers, 875 feet in length and designed to be driven by engines of 180,000 horsepower at a speed of thirty-five knots, which is five knots greater than that of any existing battle cruiser.

Every one who takes an intelligent interest in the navy and who in these perilous days does not flinch will have noticed that these fine ships and the storm centre of a bitter controversy among the experts. The questions involved are technical, and there has been so much personal feeling injected into the discussion by the engineers of the Navy Department that the lay reader may well be wondering what all the trouble is about.

It frequently happens that in a complicated question there is one outstanding fact which, if it is firmly grasped, will resolve at once the whole puzzle and relegate to their proper subordinate place the many collateral questions with which the main issue has been clouded.

It is so in this battle cruiser discussion, in which the very serious fact that one-half of the boilers of these ships are placed above the waterline, where they would quickly be shot away, has been lost sight of in the discussion of what kind of motive power (electric drive or geared drive) should be used to obtain the desired high speed. For these magnificent ships are designed to fight—that is the be-all and end-all of their existence. And the question whether the use of electric power will make them more economical when they are cruising in times of peace should be altogether subordinated to the question as to whether they can take the hard knocks of a modern sea fight and maintain their high speed unimpaired through an engagement.

What renders the placing of these boilers above the waterline so suicidal is that they form part of the "vitals" of the ship, in which are included the boilers, engines, steering gear and magazines. So important are these that they have always been placed below the waterline (water being impenetrable by shell fire), and to make assurance doubly sure, the naval architect has covered the ship from side to side and from stern to stern with a heavy steel deck, the "protective deck." Secure within this shelter, the motive power will drive the ship and the steering gear control her movements, even though a storm of shells is piercing her above-water hull and tearing the upper structure to pieces.

The security of the boilers, the need for giving them all possible protection, is particularly urgent in these battle cruisers, for the excess speed of five knots which they possess over foreign battle cruisers is their most valuable fighting asset. They have this high speed to enable them to overtake the enemy, to crush the head of his line and concentrate upon his leading ships an overwhelming fire, crushing in the head of his column, ship by ship. This was what Admiral Jellicoe was doing to the German line when, darkness

**THE PRESIDENT RESPONSIBLE**

**Why a Reader Feels That Patience and Trust Have Ceased To Be Virtues**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: It is indeed consoling that at least one newspaper in New York City insists upon the duty of President Wilson to call an extra session of Congress in face of the danger which threatens our country, and this you have done in several able editorials.  
"The Times" and other papers continue to place the blame of inaction on Congress. But there is little doubt in the minds of most people that if President Wilson chose to go ahead this government, as it is passing, before Congress he would get almost unanimous support in carrying out any measures for the safeguarding of American lives and honor.

From Washington's time down to the present there have always been some members of Congress who preferred the easiest to the honorable way. But when called upon for a decision by a courageous leader the majority have always stood for firm and have always been in dealing with a foreign aggressor. We have no reason to believe it would be otherwise now. The President and Congress should work together in such a crisis. It is certain that unlimited powers to do as he saw fit, should not be conferred upon any President, no matter how able his qualities.

When diplomatic relations with Germany were broken the resolution indorsing President Wilson's action was nearly unanimous, though it was thought then it would almost inevitably lead to war. So it would seem that in the present case it is the Chief Executive himself who is sidestepping the issue. The past record of the President has shown that when he really had a cause at heart he never failed to press for it with all the weight of his influence.

The fact that he fails to do so, in regard to the arming of ships, leads to the conclusion that he still hopes to find a way out—with or without honor.  
Those who persist in urging us to "trust the President" are asking us to continue to put faith in a man who has never yet made good in any crisis of our foreign affairs during the last three years. And American citizenship to-day outside of the three-mile limit is a thing to jeer at. Under these circumstances patience and trust have ceased to be virtues, and should be abandoned in favor of action and demand for immediate and courageous action.

Each day that we submit to German threat and dictation adds to the danger of the situation. Germany is using every moment of delay in efficient preparation, while our Administration has entirely failed to urge the speeding up of our own preparedness plans. On the contrary, enthusiastic zeal has been rebuked and discouraged.

A President who has not the mentality to act with promptness and vigor in such a crisis loses the right to a nation's confidence. Nor can one who entertains with calmness the possibility of the victory of ruthless force in the world be relied upon to protect the lives and property of our citizens in time of aggression.  
Then let all true Americans awake and demand right action, whether it means peace or war. In the beginning of the trouble it would probably have meant peace. Now we know what we must have. But we do know that American lives and honor must be safeguarded or we shall go down to disaster at some future day. Let the good work of The Tribune go on!  
G. M. W.  
New York, Feb. 26, 1917.

**Critics of Mr. Wilson**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: I have just read in this morning's Tribune the statement made by Dudley Field Malone that "America has twenty million critics of President Wilson's foreign policy, one million of whom are men who are not earning \$25 a week for the support of their families."  
This jibe of Mr. Malone's may be true, but when we consider the ability of the average politician, holding political office, may it not also be true that a large proportion of the one million so sneeringly referred to may be better qualified to criticize Mr. Wilson's foreign policy than the average politician to assist in directing and shaping it?  
CHAS. E. DALRYMPLE.  
New Brunswick, N. J., Feb. 26, 1917.

**NEW YORK'S ACCUSED ART**

**A Heartick Critic Finds Much to Lamp in Our Public Monuments**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In The Tribune of February 16 I read a letter from the president of the Art Alliance of America, bawling the fact that the Cathedral of St. John the Divine has windows which are replicas of old European glass. The writer goes on to say that we have the artists and the artisans to produce the best results in art, if only the academic Pharisees who control the destinies of creative architectural beauty in this country will wake up and give their fellow artists a chance.

I am not having seen the windows in question. I am unable to discuss the point of their inferiority or superiority to the modern examples of American stained glass, but in a very large Gothic church it would seem to be safer to stick to an imitation of the great originals.

In the matter of sculpture as applied to architectural adornment I feel that, possibly, no many years ago, when the city was in its infancy, and having seen their enchanting achievements in collaboration with architects at the various expositions and world's fairs, we of New York City have been encouraged to hope for better results than we have received at their hands.

We have all hoped for great things from the influence of the Municipal Art Society and have felt sure that the mistakes of the past as represented by some of the statues in Central Park, could never be repeated. But a trifling blot on an otherwise agreeable prospect is Robert Burns, with a broken back, in comparison with the more haunting misdeeds of recent years. One can walk through the park and admire the trees and not look at Robert Burns at all, but who can go by Columbus Circle and escape the spectacle of the Maine Monumental Gate? Or who can walk up Fifth Avenue without seeing the comic opera of the statues of the American sculptor in the pediments of the Public Library, or those august beards which have been called by some one "the Presbyterians' lions"? And we cannot think we are unreasonable in feeling a deep disappointment every time we look at the works of a great sculptor has given us for the adornment of this building.

And, finally, who can approach the Plaza without heartick regrets that so great an opportunity for beauty and joy has been thrown away? There is the great site of the Plaza Hotel, with its imposing mass of the Vanderbilt house and its handsome grille, and, above all, there is the Sherman statue, a hinging challenge to architects and artists to supplement it, to face it with something worthy and in the grand manner.

And this precious space, infinitely precious to New Yorkers as being the only big open space available for handsome treatment, has been irretrievably cluttered up with unmeaning trivialities in Portland cement.

Is New York accused? The few beautiful things we possess are generally placed where they cannot be seen, as, for instance, the Pennsylvania Station—one of the beautiful buildings of the world and a glory of which America may be proud in perspective, and its surroundings must always be sordid.

But New York is beautiful in its atmospheric effects, with the great cliffs of its skyscrapers glowing pink or golden in the rays of the setting sun, while the twilight streets below glitter with lights.  
N. A. A.  
New York, Feb. 22, 1917.

**No Need for Investigation**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: As a farmer I believe that there should be an end to the appropriations which are now coming before the public for the investigations by committees into the high cost of the necessities of life.

I think our President in error when he advocates the appropriation of \$400,000 for a Federal investigation into the abnormally high prices of food products. Different investigations of these subjects have taken place in the past, and who of us ever heard of an arrest, an indictment or a fine being imposed upon any one as a result of such investigation? No. The result is that the investigators draw large salaries, create a large expense, and the taxpayers pay the bills.

The agricultural population of the United States has diminished from 32 per cent in 1820 to 32.4 per cent in 1910, while in the last fifteen years the population of the United States has increased over 23,000,000. The great industrial and commercial centres have been built up, trying to outlive the world, at the expense and to the detriment of the rural communities. Centralization ideas have dominated the country. Rural schools have been discarded and the buildings permitted to go to decay in New England. The young men of the farms rush to the cities, where they have shorter hours of labor, and pay higher wages for their city occupations, and have become consumers instead of producers. To illustrate, take the agricultural state of New Hampshire. That produces only 25 per cent, or one-quarter, of the products she consumes. While the American farmer individually produces from two to seven, or an average of four and one-half times as much as his competitors, he has failed to produce sufficient to feed the world.

The great law of supply and demand now comes in, establishing the high prices. If the investor in these commodities and the operators in the munition plants in the United States to-day would come to the farms in New England and help guide the plough and other agricultural tools, plenty would be spread upon their tables, and the use of food in defence? W. W. KIMBALL.  
Boston, Mass., Feb. 26, 1917.

**Why Not a Woman Principal?**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: I have watched with interest the campaign being waged on Miss Turner's behalf for the principality of Erasmus Hall. That such a campaign is necessary is the indictment of the educational system which rests the nominating and the appointing power for the higher positions in our educational system. Why must her friends work for that which is already hers by every argument of right and justice? I don't count myself among Miss Turner's personal friends—I've rarely met her outside of Erasmus Hall; but I've been familiar with her work in that school for fifteen years; I have a daughter who is a graduate of Erasmus, and I can vouch for the scholarship, the spirit, the high ideal of the school.

I am credibly informed that the Board of Education intends to load Miss Turner with compliments, to tell her the burden of handling boys is too great for a woman (though Miss Turner has done it for years) and then to give her the Julia Richman High School—an all-girls school.  
Magnificent reward for a lifetime of devoted service!

If this plan succeeds, if Miss Turner is denied a promotion so undeniably her due, the women in the system will cease to believe that it is any use to give the best that is in them.  
If the Duchess of Fife can be considered for the chancellorship of Aberdeen University, in Scotland, under the exigencies of war, Miss Turner can be given the principality of her own school here in America, in the name of justice and decent human treatment.  
A FLATBUSH TAXPAYER.  
Brooklyn, Feb. 23, 1917.

**Open Doors to Laboratories**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I say a word in regard to your recent editorial, "Open Doors to Laboratories"? This is a subject so frequently agitated that any one can see it is of immense importance. Secrecy always creates suspicion, and those who practise it as persistently as the virologists do are their own worst enemies.

It is a significant fact that in a number of states New York being first in the list, the humane and humane cruelty to animals is being pondered to the effect that its provisions shall not apply to scientific research. There is only one conclusion to be drawn from this—namely, that vivisection, being itself cruel and causing suffering, is an offence against this law and therefore must be exempted to save those who practise it from the penalty.

And here is another interesting fact. Physicians who are known to be opposed to vivisection find it difficult to gain admittance to witness it, except to see only its mildest form. William R. D. Blackwood, M. D., the forms of living graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and a physician of good standing and large practice, has been refused entrance four times to the laboratories of a prominent medical institution. And why? Because he had not sufficient technical knowledge to enable him to understand the work. No, simply because he is known to be an animal rightsist. Is not the public justified in drawing its own conclusions?

KATHARINE S. NICHOLSON.  
Philadelphia, Penn., Feb. 24, 1917.